



Performance Update:

Silver Star

New York–Washington– Columbia SC– Tampa–Miami

	FY 2005 (12 months)	FY 2006 (12 months)	FY 2006 higher (lower) than FY 2005, percent
Basic operations			
Route mileage between the two principal endpoints	1,522		-
Train-miles	1,106,275	1,096,949	(0.8%)
Traffic and revenues			
Passenger-trips	295,709	311,509	5.3%
Average load factor	55.3%	55.0%	(0.3%)
Number of city-pairs served (FY 2005)	631		-
Percentage of traffic in most important city-pair (FY 2005)	4%		-
Passenger revenue	\$21,664,517	\$24,197,349	11.7%
Total route revenue	\$24,587,163	\$27,408,382	11.5%
Service quality			
On-time performance: Average endpoint delay-minutes per train operation	161	173	7.3%
On-time performance: Average endpoint delay-minutes per 100 miles traveled	10.6	11.4	7.3%
Financial performance - per Amtrak's "Strategic Business Line" format			
NOTE: Route performance results exclude Federal support for operations, unallocated system costs, and capital charges. Also excluded from the calculations are depreciation and interest. These results must be regarded as preliminary and provisional as the FRA (with Amtrak's cooperation) has undertaken a study of "avoidable" and "fully allocated" costing methods on a route-by-route basis, as mandated by Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (section entitled "Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation").			
Route profit/(loss) per passenger-mile, based on avoidable expenses (see NOTE above)	(\$0.101)	(\$0.099)	1.6%
Route profit/(loss) per passenger-mile, based on total attributed expenses (see NOTE above)	(\$0.216)	(\$0.216)	(0.2%)

***Notes to Performance Updates:
Selected Amtrak Routes
Utilizing the Southeast Corridor***

- All data are for the full Fiscal Year 2005 and the full Fiscal Year 2006, except:
- City-pair data (“number of city-pairs served” and “percentage of traffic [i.e., revenue] in most important city-pair” are for FY 2005.
- Data are unaudited.
- All columns labeled “Percent Change” show the percentage by which the FY 2006 results are higher (lower) than (not necessarily “better (worse) than”) the FY 2005 results.
- The percent change in average load factor (which is itself a percentage) represents the percentage point spread (i.e., year 2006 load factor minus year 2005 load factor), not the ratio of ratios.